arXiv:1610.01062v1 [math.CO] 4 Oct 2016

On more variants of the Majority Problem

Paul-Elliot Anglès d'Auriac * Francis Maisonneuve †
Vivien Maisonneuve ‡ Emmanuel Preissmann §
Myriam Preissmann ¶

October 5, 2016

Abstract

The problem we are considering is the following. A colorblind player is given a set $\mathcal{B} = \{b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_N\}$ of N colored balls. He knows that each ball is colored either red or green, and that there are less green balls (this will be called a *Red-green coloring*), but he cannot distinguish the two colors. For any two balls he can ask whether they are colored the same. His goal is to determine the set of all green balls of $\mathcal{B}$ (and hence the set of all red balls). We study here the case where the Red-green coloring is such that there are at most p green balls, where p is given, and denote by $Q(N, p, \leq)$ the minimum integer k such that there exists a method that finds for sure, for any Red-green coloring, the color of each ball of $\mathcal{B}$ after at most k (color) comparisons. We extend the cases for which the exact value of $Q(N, p, \leq)$ is known and provide lower and upper bounds for $Q(N, p, =)$ (defined similarly as $Q(N, p, \leq)$, but for a Red-green coloring with exactly p green balls).

1 Introduction

There are several problems of the kind of the one considered in this paper. In the so-called "Majority problem", the goal is to find a ball of the "majority color" (red in our setting) within a minimum of comparisons. Saks and Werman [6] and later Alonso et al [2] and Wiener [8] have shown, with different methods, that $N - b(N)$ comparisons are necessary and sufficient to find for sure a red

*peada@free.fr
†Mines-ParisTech, 60 boulevard Saint-Michel 75272 Paris, France ; francis.maisonneuve@gmail.com
‡v.maisonneuve@gmail.com
§emmanuel.preissmann@gmail.com
¶Univ. Grenoble Alpes, CNRS, G-SCOP, Grenoble, France ; myriam.preissmann@grenoble-inp.fr

ball whatever the Red-green coloring, $b(N)$ being the number of 1s in the binary representation of N.

To show the sufficiency it is enough to give a method using at most $N-b(N)$ comparisons. Since more complicated versions of this method and several parts of its validity proof will be used later, we describe it in details (similarly as in [1]). The method uses boxes in which we place the balls, the *cardinality* of a box is the number of balls that it contains. During the procedure the contents of the boxes will vary : a box is called *monocolored* if all balls it contains are colored the same and else it is said *bicolored*. A bicolored box is said *balanced* if it has an equal number of balls of each color. In the beginning we have N boxes and we put exactly one ball in each, so they are all monocolored. At each step we compare two balls that belongs to two distinct monocolored boxes of the same cardinality and then we merge the balls into one of the two boxes. This box will stay monocolored if the two compared balls have the same color, else it will become balanced. The other box is thrown away. So, at any time of this process the cardinality of each box is a power of 2 and all bicolored boxes are balanced. We have to stop when no two monocolored boxes have the same cardinality. We claim that then all balls in the monocolored box of largest cardinality are red and we will now explain why.

As there is an equal number of red and green balls among the bicolored boxes, and since we have a Red-green coloring, there should be more red balls than green balls among the monocolored boxes. Let 2^k be the largest cardinality of a monocolored box. By the principle of the procedure, the number of balls that are in the other monocolored boxes is at most $\Sigma_{i=0}^{k-1}2^i$ (which value is set to 0 in case $k=0$). But $2^k > \Sigma_{i=0}^{k-1}2^i$, so the only way to have a majority of red balls among the monocolored boxes is that the balls in the box of size 2^k are red.

It remains to estimate the number of comparisons used by the method. Let $B_1, B_2, \ldots, B_r$ and $B_{r+1}, B_{r+2}, \ldots, B_{r+s}$ be respectively all monocolored and all balanced boxes obtained at the end of the procedure (where $r \geq 1$ and $s \geq 0$) and let 2^{k_i} be the cardinality of each B_i. We notice that the number of boxes decreases by 1 after each comparison ; so the fact that the process ends with $r+s$ boxes means that we have done $N-(r+s)$ comparisons. Now, since each ball is in exactly one box, one has $N = \Sigma_{i=1}^{r+s}2^{k_i}$ and this implies that $r+s \geq b(N)$. We can now conclude that we can provide one red ball after at most $N-b(N)$ comparisons.

2 The Identification Problem

We describe now the problems which are the subject of this paper. There is again a given set of N balls colored with a Red-green coloring, but the goal now is to determine for sure the color of each of the balls within a minimum number of comparisons. Furthermore we will also consider more restricted kinds of Red-green colorings : given an integer p, a Red-green coloring of N balls will

be said *p-majored* if there are at most p green balls and it will be said *p-equal* if there are exactly p green balls.

Given two integers N and $p < \frac{N}{2}$ we call $(N, p, \leq)$-identification (respectively $(N, p, =)$-identification) the problem of determining for sure all the colors of N balls colored by a p-majored Red-green coloring (respectively by a p-equal Red-green coloring) and we denote by $Q(N, p, \leq)$ (respectively $Q(N, p, =)$) the minimum number of comparisons that are necessary to solve any instance of the $(N, p, \leq)$-identification problem (respectively of the $Q(N, p, =)$-identification problem).

2.1 Upper bounds

To get upper bounds for $Q(N, p, \leq)$ or $Q(N, p, =)$ we will define a procedure similar to the one above, using boxes. However, as we are now interested by the colors of all balls, we have to keep balls of distinct colors separated. For that purpose we will use boxes with two compartments and will all along manage to have the balls in the same compartment of a box to be of the same color. A box will be said of Type $[x, y]$ if $x \leq y$ and there are x balls in one of its compartment and y in the other. A 2-compartment box which has one empty compartment will be said *monocolored*. Initially we have no information on the colors and thus we may consider that the balls are each in a monocolored box of Type $[0, 1]$.

Given two balls b and b' belonging to two distinct boxes, respectively B and B', the result of the comparison of b and b' may be expressed in terms of boxes as follows : if b and b' are of the same color then all balls of B' that are in the same compartment than b' are put in the compartment of B containing b and all remaining balls of B' are put in the compartment of B not containing b, else we do the reverse. Then the empty box B' is thrown away. So if B was of Type $[x, y]$ and B' of Type $[x', y']$, after the comparison the box B will be of Type either $[x+x', y+y']$ or, depending whether $x+y' \leq y+x'$ or not, $[x+y', y+x']$ or $[y+x', x+y']$.

We observe that the resulting box would have been the same for any other couple of balls in B and B'. So given two distinct boxes B and B', we will call *result of the comparison of box B' to box B* the box B obtained by comparing any two balls $b \in B$ and $b' \in B'$ (this non-symmetrical definition will be sometimes useful in proofs, as it keeps a name for the resulting box).

We notice that trivially $N - 1$ comparisons are enough to solve the identification problems (just compare one ball to all the others and use the fact that there are less green balls).

2.2 Lower bounds

To get a lower bound on the number of comparisons it is useful to characterize what is a "method solving the $(N, p, \leq)$-identification problem". As it should

provide, at any step, a couple of balls to compare, depending on the result of the already done comparisons, it is natural to represent such a method M by a *rooted tree* T_M as follows :

each non-leaf vertex u :

- is labeled with a set of two balls $\{b(u), b'(u)\}$,
- has at most two children, being linked to u by arcs of distinct labels "$=$" or "$\neq$" ;

and each leaf-vertex corresponds to a correct solution of the $(N, p, \leq)$-identification problem.

The rooted tree T_M is the "user manual" of the method M.

As described above, the consequences of a sequence of comparisons, in terms of possible colorings for the balls, is fully expressed by the resulting partition $\mathcal{P}$ of the set of balls into 2-compartment boxes : in a box, the balls that are in one of the compartments should all have the same color and those that are in the other compartment all have the other color. A p-majored Red-green coloring is said *compatible* with the results of the already done comparisons if and only if it satisfies these constraints. Let us denote by $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{P})}$ the set of p-majored Red-green colorings that are compatible with a partition $\mathcal{P}$. Notice that it would be a waste to compare two balls that are colored the same (respectively differently) in all colorings of $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{P})$; the answer can only be "$=$" (respectively $\neq$). In particular, it has no sense to compare balls that are in the same box of $\mathcal{P}$ or to keep doing comparisons when $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{P})$ contains only one coloring. In the following, we will never consider a method doing such useless comparisons.

A path $P = (r = u_0, u_1 \ldots, u_k = u)$ in T_M $(k \geq 1)$, from the root r to another vertex u, corresponds to a sequence of comparisons of $b(u_i)$ and $b'(u_i)$ with answer equal to the label of the arc $u_i u_{i+1}$, for each $0 \leq i \leq k-1$. So, we can deduce the resulting partition $\mathcal{P}(u)$ and the compatible colorings $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{P}(u))$ that are obtained if, applying the method M, we get the answers as depicted by the path P.

A vertex of T_M will be said at *level* k it is at distance k from the root. The *height* of T_M is the maximum level of a vertex of T_M.

From all preceding remarks we get the following property.

Property 1. *Any rooted tree T_M associated to a method M solving the $(N, p, \leq)$-identification problem satisfies the following properties:*

(i) for every non-leaf vertex u : $|\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{P}(u))| \geq 2$, there are colorings in $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{P}(u))$ where $b(u)$ and $b'(u)$ are colored the same, and others where $b(u)$ and $b'(u)$ are colored differently,

(ii) for every leaf vertex u : $|\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{P}(u))| = 1$,

(iii) no two leaves correspond to the same p-majored Red-green coloring,

(iv) the partition of a vertex at level k consists in $N - k$ boxes obtained after k comparisons,

(v) the maximum number of comparisons used by an execution of M is equal to the height of T_M.

Notice that similar remarks and property are valid in the case of the $(N, p, =)$-identification problem.

Hence, the following property of a binary tree may be used for lower bounds on the number of comparisons of a method solving the $(N, p, \leq)$- or $(N, p, =)$-identification problem.

Property 2. *A binary tree of height k has at most 2^k leaves.*

2.3 Bounds and exact values for $Q(N, p, \leq)$

The theorem below is due to Aigner [1] but we did a different proof (that we find simpler).

Theorem 1. *[1] Let N and p be any integers such that $1 \leq p < \frac{N}{2}$, we have:*

$$Q(N, p, \leq) \leq N + 1 - \lfloor \frac{N+1}{p+1} \rfloor.$$

Proof. We first describe a procedure that will partition the balls into some particular boxes. As usual we start with N boxes of Type $[0, 1]$.

We first choose a box B_1, and one by one we compare $B \neq B_1$ to B_1 until B_1 becomes of Type $[x_1, y_1 = p+1]$. Notice that then $x_1 \leq p$, and since $N \geq 2p+1$, we are sure to reach this Type. Then we put B_1 apart in a closet, so that all remaining available boxes are of Type $[0, 1]$.

We continue building at the i-th step, from the available boxes, a box B_i until either: - reaching for the first time a box of Type $[x_i, y_i = p+1-\Sigma_{1 \leq j < i} x_j]$ (and then $x_i < y_i$), or - voiding the set of available boxes. The last box is put in the closet even if it does not fulfill the requirements on the Type. If however it does, then we furthermore add an empty box of Type $[0, 0]$ to the closet.

Let $m+1$ be the number of boxes in the closet at the end of the procedure. By construction all $B_1, B_2, \ldots, B_m$ (in the order they have been put in the closet) are of Type $[x_i, y_i]$ with $x_i < y_i = p+1-\Sigma_{1 \leq j < i} x_j$ and B_{m+1} is of Type $[x_{m+1}, y_{m+1}]$ where $y_{m+1} < p+1-\Sigma_{1 \leq j \leq m} x_j$ (in case $[x_{m+1}, y_{m+1}] = [0, 0]$ we have $0 \leq x_m < y_m = p+1-\Sigma_{1 \leq j < m} x_j$ and then $y_{m+1} = 0 < p+1-\Sigma_{1 \leq j \leq m} x_j$).

We will show that $m \geq \lfloor \frac{N+1}{p+1} \rfloor - 1$. Indeed :

$$\begin{aligned} N &= \Sigma_{i=1}^{m+1} |B_i| = \Sigma_{i=1}^{m+1} x_i + \Sigma_{i=1}^{m+1} y_i \\ &< x_1 + x_2 + \ldots + x_{m+1} + (m+1)(p+1) \\ &\qquad - x_1 - (x_1 + x_2) - \ldots - (x_1 + x_2 + \ldots + x_m) \\ &= (m+1)(p+1) - (m-1)x_1 - (m-2)x_2 - \ldots - x_{m-1} + x_{m+1}. \end{aligned}$$

As $x_i \geq 0$ for each $1 \leq i \leq m$, and $x_{m+1} \leq p$ (since $x_{m+1} \leq y_{m+1} < p+1-\Sigma_{1\leq j\leq m} x_j$), we get that $N < (m+1)(p+1)+p$, so $N+1 < (m+2)(p+1)$ and $m+1 \geq \lfloor \frac{N+1}{p+1} \rfloor$.

Finally we show how we can deduce the colors of the balls from the Types of $B_1, B_2, \ldots, B_{m+1}$. We remark that, except for the balls in B_{m+1}, the colors are all forced. Indeed, by definition, the box B_1 has one compartment filled with $p+1$ balls, so all these balls must be red and then all the x_1 balls of the other compartment of B_1 must be green, and there is no more than $p - x_1$ green balls in the other boxes. So since B_2 is of Type $[x_2, p+1-x_1]$ we deduce that the balls in the compartment of cardinality $p+1-x_1$ of B_2 are red balls and the other x_2 balls of B_2 are green balls. We can continue this way until B_m. If B_{m+1} is empty we are done. Else, by comparing B_{m+1} to B_m we will finally know the colors of all balls. As previously noticed, the number of comparisons is equal to N minus the number of non empty boxes at the end of the process. Thus we get that $Q(N, p, \leq) \leq N - m \leq N + 1 - \lfloor \frac{N+1}{p+1} \rfloor$. □

In his paper Aigner showed that the upper bound in Theorem 1 is near from the exact value of $Q(N, p, \leq)$ (Theorem 4 in [1]). Our next Theorem 2 extends its results and partially answers a question of Wildon (Problem 8.1 in [10]).

Theorem 2. *Let $N, 1 \leq p < \frac{N}{2}$, q and $0 \leq r \leq p$ be integers such that $N = q(p+1) + r$, we have :*

- $N - q \leq Q(N, p, \leq) \leq N + 1 - q$,
- $Q(N, p, \leq) = N - q$ *for* $r = p$,
- $Q(N, p, \leq) = N + 1 - q$ *for* $0 \leq r \leq \lfloor \frac{p}{2} \rfloor$.

Proof. We will first show that $Q(N, p, \leq) \geq N - q$ regardless of the remainder of the division of N by $p+1$. Let M be any method that solves the $(N, p, \leq)$-identification problem. The rooted tree T_M has a leaf u which is connected to the root by a path whose all arcs are labeled with "=". The partition $\mathcal{P}(u)$ contains then only monocolored boxes.

In case one box B of $\mathcal{P}(u)$ is of cardinality at most p, then there will be at least two p-majored Red-green colorings compatible with the results of the comparisons : one where all balls are red, and one where all balls in B are green and all other balls are red. This is in contradiction with the fact that u is a leaf (Property 1-(ii)).

So all boxes of $\mathcal{P}(u)$ are of cardinality at least $p+1$. By the definition of N, q, and r we may now conclude that $\mathcal{P}(u)$ contains at most q boxes. Then, u should be at level $k \geq N - q$ (Property 1-(iv)) and the method M uses at least $N - q$ comparisons to detect the p-majored Red-green coloring associated to u. We have proved that $Q(N, p, \leq) \geq N - q$.

On another hand, by Theorem 1, we have $Q(N,p,\leq) \leq N+1-\lfloor\frac{N+1}{p+1}\rfloor$. Noticing that $\lfloor\frac{N+1}{p+1}\rfloor$ is equal either to q if $r \neq p$ or to $q+1$ else, we get the two first assertions of Theorem 2.

Assume now that $0 \leq r \leq \lfloor\frac{p}{2}\rfloor$ and that there exists a method M that solves the $(N,p,\leq)$-identification problem using only $N-q$ comparisons. By Property 1, the height of T_M is $N-q$ and the partition associated to any leaf contains at least q boxes. Then, from the first part of our proof, with the same definition of u, $\mathcal{P}(u)$ contains exactly q boxes of cardinality at least $p+1$. Let $P=(r,u_1,u_2,\ldots,u_{N-q}=u)$ the path from the root r to u in T_M and let

$$i=\min\{1\leq j\leq N-q-1 | \mathcal{P}(u_{j+1}) \text{ contains } q \text{ boxes of cardinality at least } p+1\}$$

(i does exist since $N-q-1$ satisfies the requirement).

Consider the vertex v_{i+1} connected to u_i by an arc labeled " $\neq$ " (the other child of u_i is u_{i+1}). From our assumptions, the partition $\mathcal{P}(v_{i+1})$ consists into $q-1$ monocolored boxes of cardinality at least $p+1$, called *big monocolored boxes of* $\mathcal{P}(v_{i+1})$, one box B of cardinality at least $p+1$ of Type $[x_q,y_q]$ where $1\leq x_q\leq y_q\leq p$ and $N-(i+1)-q$ monocolored boxes of cardinality at most p, called *small monocolored boxes of* $\mathcal{P}(v_{i+1})$.

We denote by A the set of balls belonging to a big monocolored box of $\mathcal{P}(v_{i+1})$, B' the set of the $x_q\leq p$ balls in one compartment of B, B'' the set of the $y_q\leq p$ balls in the other compartment of B, and C the set of balls belonging to a small monocolored box of $\mathcal{P}(v_{i+1})$.

From v_{i+1} we will follow a path in T_M using the following rule that will all along ensure partitions with exactly one bicolored box, containing B' in one compartment and B'' in the other, and monocolored boxes containing balls from $A\cup C$.

Rule : We start from the vertex v_{i+1}. As long as we are on a non-leaf vertex v labeled $(b_1(v),b_2(v))$, we repeat the following :

- if $b_1(v)$ and $b_2(v)$ are both in monocolored boxes we follow the arc labeled " = " and get to the next vertex v,
- else one of them, say $b_1(v)$, is in a bicolored box of $\mathcal{P}(v)$. In that case, if in $\mathcal{P}(v)$ the balls in the box containing $b_2(v)$ are all in C then we follow the arc labeled with the answer that put $b_2(v)$ on the same side than the balls in B' and else we follow the other arc with the answer that put $b_2(v)$ on the same side than the balls in B'' ; and get to the next vertex v.

The process stops when we reach a leaf-vertex l. By the rule, $\mathcal{P}(l)$ has monocolored boxes whose contents are included in $A\cup C$ and exactly one bicolored box B_l whose one compartment has a set B'_l of balls such that $B'\subseteq B'_l\subseteq B'\cup C$ and whose other compartment has a set B''_l of balls such that $B''\subseteq B''_l\subseteq B''\cup A\cup C$.

Claim 1. $|B'|+|C|\leq p$.

Proof. Since there are at least $(q-1)(p+1)$ balls in A we have at most $p+1+r$ balls in $B' \cup B'' \cup C$. Since $|B' \cup B''| \geq p+1$, one has $|B' \cup B''| = p+1+s$, for some $0 \leq s \leq r \leq \lfloor \frac{p}{2} \rfloor$. Then $0 \leq |C| \leq N - (q(p+1)+s) = r - s$, and $|B'| \leq \lfloor \frac{p+1+s}{2} \rfloor \leq \lceil \frac{p+1+s}{2} \rceil \leq |B''| \leq p$, so that

$$|B'| + |C| \leq \lfloor \frac{p+1+s}{2} \rfloor + r - s = \lfloor \frac{p+1-s}{2} \rfloor + r \leq \lfloor \frac{p+1}{2} \rfloor + \lfloor \frac{p}{2} \rfloor = p.$$

The claim is proved.

Claim 2. *No monocolored box of $\mathcal{P}(l)$ is included in C.*

Proof. Let us assume the contrary and let $C_1 \subseteq C$ be the set of balls of a monocolored box of $\mathcal{P}(l)$. By definition $B'_l \cup C_1 \subseteq B' \cup C$, so by Claim 1 we have $|B'_l \cup C_1| \leq p$. Then there are at least two p-majored Red-green colorings compatible with $\mathcal{P}(l)$: one colors in green only the vertices of B'_l and the other colors in green the vertices of $B'_l \cup C_1$. This contradicts the fact that l is a leaf of T_M and ends the proof of the claim. □

A few remarks are now enough to end the proof. Let us remind that $\mathcal{P}(v_{i+1})$ contains $N - (i+1+q)$ monocolored boxes included in C. By Claim 2 they all disappear after doing all the comparisons indicated by the path from v_{i+1} to l obtained by applying the Rule. It is straightforward to verify that each of these comparisons decreases the number of monocolored boxes included in C only if at least one ball used for the comparison is in a monocolored box included in C, and it decreases this number by at most 1. Morover, by our assumption on M, the height of T_M and hence the level of l is at most $N-q$, so that at most $N-(i+1-q)$ comparisons are done from v_{i+1} to l. From all these facts we deduce that each comparison done to get $\mathcal{P}(l)$ from $\mathcal{P}(v_{i+1})$ concerns at least one monocolored box included in C. So, as we followed the Rule, the bicolored box B_l of $\mathcal{P}(l)$ is of Type $(|B'_l|, |B''_l|)$, for $B'_l \subseteq B' \cup C$ and $B''_l = B''$.

Then, by Claim 1 and the fact that $|B''| \leq p$, each compartment of B_l contains at most p balls and we have at least two p-majored Red-green colorings compatible with $\mathcal{P}(l)$: everything colored red except the balls of one of the two compartments of B_l. This contradicts the fact that l is a leaf of T_M. □

Wildon [10] has checked by a computer search the values of $Q(N,p,\leq)$ for $N \leq 30$. In particular he listed all such $Q(N,p,\leq)$ that are equal to the lower bound $N-q$. Our (two different) programs confirmed the list. It doesn't seem easy to derive some general results from these values, however we noticed that in this list we have exactly all couples (N,p) such that $N \leq 30$ and:

- $N = 3p+1+k(p+1)$ for $p \geq 4$ and $k \geq 0$,
- $N = 3p+k(p+1)$ for $p \geq 7$ and $k \geq 0$, and for $p=6$ and $k=1$,
- $N = 3p-1+k(p+1)$ for $p \geq 9$ and $k \geq 0$.

The procedures obtained by the programs are not easy to analyze and find directly an optimal procedure for these cases is not so simple. We found methods within $Q(N,p,\leq)$ comparisons for $(N,p) = (13,4)(16,5)$ and $(19,6)$. These couples correspond to the three first couples such that $N = 3p+1$ and and yet we have not managed to find similar methods for them.

2.4 Bounds and exact values for $Q(N,p,=)$

In the preceding section we considered the problem of identifying all the colors of the balls for a Red-green coloring with at most p green balls. What happens in case we know that there are exactly p green balls ? The next theorem gives an upper-bound of $Q(N,p,=)$.

Theorem 3. *Let N and p be integers such that $1 \leq p < \frac{N}{2}$, and let m be the largest integer such that $2^m \leq \min(N-2p, 2p)$, we have :*

$$Q(N,p,=) \leq N+1-m-\lfloor \frac{N+2-2^m}{p+1} \rfloor$$

Proof. Assume first that $m = 0$. Since $p \geq 1$, by the definition of m we get then that $N - 2p = 1$. From the fact that $Q(N,p,=) \leq Q(N,p,\leq)$ and Theorem 1, we have $Q(N,p,=) \leq N+1-\lfloor \frac{N+1}{p+1} \rfloor$, so Theorem 3 is proved in the case $m = 0$.

From now on we will assume that $m \geq 1$. As for the preceding proofs, we will use a method which compares boxes, but this time we will have several locations for the boxes : the *laboratory* which initially contains all the balls in boxes of Type $[0,1]$, the *reserve* that all along contains only balanced bicolored boxes and a *podium* which contains steps numbered starting from 0: the ith step of the podium is provided to receive a monocolored box of size 2^i.

Any situation where the laboratory contains only boxes of Type $[0,1]$ and the reserve only balanced boxes will be said *a correct situation*. The *overage of a correct situation* is equal to the overage of red over green among balls that are in the laboratory or in the reserve. Notice that it is the same as the overage among balls in the laboratory since the boxes in the reserve are balanced.

We now describe a "subroutine" $\mathcal{S}(i)$, for $i \geq 0$, which starting from any correct situation with an overage $O_i \geq 2^i$, builds one monocolored box of size 2^i , and ends with a correct situation with a new overage of at least $O_i - 2^i$.

- For $i = 0$, any box of the laboratory satisfies the size constraint. After putting it aside, the situation is still correct and the overage decreases by at most one (in case the ball in the box we have chosen happened to be red).

- For $i = 1$, let us compare, one by one, couples of balls in the laboratory: as long as we obtain a balanced box we put it in the reserve. Since there are at least two more red balls than green balls (the overage is assumed to be at least 2), we are sure to get once a monocolored couple. Putting

it aside, we obtain a correct situation whose overage has decreased by at most 2.

- The same way, we may define inductively $\mathcal{S}(i+1)$ from $\mathcal{S}(i)$. Assume $\mathcal{S}(i)$ exists, we will show that then $\mathcal{S}(i+1)$ exists.
  Suppose that we are in a correct situation with an overage of at least 2^{i+1}. We may apply $\mathcal{S}(i)$ in order to get a monocolored box B of size 2^i. We put B aside. By the induction hypothesis, the situation is then correct and the remaining balls in the laboratory have an overage of at least $2^{i+1}-2^i = 2^i$. We may apply $\mathcal{S}(i)$ again in order to obtain a second monocolored box B' of size 2^i. We then compare B and B'. If this comparison results in a bicolored box, this box is balanced and we put it into the reserve : the overage in the laboratory is still 2^{i+1} and we may repeat the procedure. Each time we get a bicolored box the number of balls in the laboratory decreases, but not the overage, so that we will finally obtain a monocolored box of size 2^{i+1}. After putting this box aside, by the induction hypothesis, the situation is correct. If the withdrawn balls are green, the overage of the final situation increases, and else it decreases by at most 2^{i+1}. So $\mathcal{S}(i+1)$ does exist.

Let μ be the largest integer such that $2^\mu \leq N - 2p$; since we assumed that $m \geq 1$, we have $\mu \geq 1$. For any integer $1 \leq \nu \leq \mu$ we will define a method $M(\nu)$ that solves the $(N, p, =)$-identification problem within at most $N + 1 - \nu - \lfloor \frac{N+2-2^\nu}{p+1} \rfloor$ comparisons. We describe now $M(\nu)$.

At Step 0 of $M(\nu)$ we start with the initial state, that is an empty podium, an empty reserve, and a laboratory containing all the balls in boxes of Type $[0, 1]$. So, at this stage, the situation is correct and the overage $\mathcal{O}(0) = N - 2p$ is by definition at least $2^\mu > \Sigma_{j=0}^{\mu-1} 2^j$. We apply $\mathcal{S}(0)$ in order to obtain a monocolored box of cardinality 1 which is put on the 0th step of the podium. Then we are in a correct situation with a positive overage $\mathcal{O}(1)$. If $\mu > 1$ then $\mathcal{O}(1) > \Sigma_{j=1}^{\mu-1} 2^j \geq 2^1$. We may continue: for each $i \leq \nu - 1 \leq \mu - 1$, Step i starts with a correct situation with an overage $\mathcal{O}(i) > \Sigma_{j=i}^{\mu-1} 2^j \geq 2^i$ and we apply $\mathcal{S}(i)$ in order to obtain a monocolored box of cardinality 2^i which is put on the ith step of the podium. We are then in a correct situation with a positive overage $\mathcal{O}(i+1)$. If $\mu > i+1$ then $O(i+1) > \Sigma_{j=i+1}^{\mu-1} 2^j \geq 2^{i+1}$.

After Step $\nu - 1$ of $M(\nu)$ we have filled ν steps of the podium with monocolored boxes of cardinality $1, 2, \ldots, 2^{\nu-1}$. Let $\mathcal{B}_\nu$ be the set of balls that are not on the podium: they are either in a box of Type [0,1] in the laboratory or in a balanced box in the reserve. The rest of the method $M(\nu)$ will mainly consists in solving the identification-problem in $\mathcal{B}_\nu$: after this is done, we will know exactly the number $p' \leq p$ of green balls in $\mathcal{B}_\nu$ and there should be $p - p'$ green balls on the podium. The binary representation of $p - p'$ then gives us the boxes of the podium containing the green balls without any further comparisons.

So let us study the minimum number of comparisons needed to solve the identification-problem in $\mathcal{B}_\nu$. Let $N_\nu = |\mathcal{B}_\nu|$, we have $N_\nu = N - (2^\nu - 1)$.

There are at most p green balls in $\mathcal{B}_\nu$ and since $2^\nu \leq N-2p$ we have (as already noticed) a positive overage of red balls in $\mathcal{B}_\nu$. In the proof of Theorem 1 we have provided a procedure P to solve the $(N_\nu, p, \leq)$-identification problem within at most $N_\nu + 1 - \lfloor \frac{N_\nu+1}{p+1} \rfloor$. However, some comparisons have already be done among the balls in $\mathcal{B}_\nu$ (they concern the balls in the reserve) and we must show that they are compatible with P. We remind that P begins by building a box B_1 of Type $[x_1, y_1 = p+1]$ with $x_1 \leq p$. Notice that by comparing one box of the reserve with the other boxes in the reserve (if any) we will obtain one balanced box B of Type $[x, x]$ for some $x \leq p$. So the procedure P may, in its attempt to build B_1 in $\mathcal{B}_\nu$, reach a situation where one box is B and all others are of Type $[0, 1]$. We may then continue to use P, providing at the end the colors of all balls of $\mathcal{B}_\nu$ within at most $N_\nu + 1 - \lfloor \frac{N_\nu+1}{p+1} \rfloor$ comparisons. To these we should add the $2^\nu - 1 - \nu$ comparisons done in order to obtain the ν boxes in the podium.

As a consequence of what we have done above, we get that $Q(N, p, =) \leq \min_{1 \leq \nu \leq \mu}(N + 1 - \nu - \lfloor \frac{N+2-2^\nu}{p+1} \rfloor)$. It remains to show which value of ν provides the minimum of $f(x) = N + 1 - x - \lfloor \frac{N+2-2^x}{p+1} \rfloor$.

We will do it by comparing the value of f for two consecutive values ν and $\nu+1$ such that $2^{\nu+1} \leq N-2p$. We may write $N = 2p+2^{\nu+1}+\ell = 2p+2^\nu+2^\nu+\ell$ where $\ell \geq 0$:

- $f(\nu) = N+1-\nu-\lfloor \frac{N+2-2^\nu}{p+1} \rfloor = N+1-\nu-\lfloor \frac{2p+2^\nu+\ell+2}{p+1} \rfloor = N-\nu-1-\lfloor \frac{2^\nu+\ell}{p+1} \rfloor$
- $f(\nu+1) = N-\nu-\lfloor \frac{N+2-2^{\nu+1}}{p+1} \rfloor = N-\nu-\lfloor \frac{2p+\ell+2}{p+1} \rfloor = N-\nu-2-\lfloor \frac{\ell}{p+1} \rfloor$

So, if $2^\nu < p+1$ then $f(\nu+1) \leq f(\nu)$ and else $f(\nu+1) \geq f(\nu)$.

In case $N-2p \leq 2p$, then any $\nu+1 \leq \mu$ verifies that $2^{\nu+1} \leq 2^\mu \leq N-2p \leq 2p$ and then $2^\nu \leq p < p+1$. So, in that case, $min_{1 \leq \nu \leq \mu}(N+1-\nu-\lfloor \frac{N+2-2^\nu}{p+1} \rfloor)$ is attained fro $\nu = \mu$, so $m = \mu$.

If $2p < N-2p$, then the minimum will be attained for m equal to the largest ν such that $2^{\nu-1} \leq p$, or equivalently $2^\nu \leq 2p$. □

Proposition 1. *Let $N \geq 3$, we have :*

$$Q(N, 1, =) = N - \lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor$$

Proof. It is easy to verify that for $N = 3$ the proposition holds. Let $N > 3$. We deduce from Theorem 3 that $Q(N, 1, =) \leq N - \lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor$. Let us show now that we also have $Q(N, 1, =) \geq N - \lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor$.

Let M be any method that solves the $(N, 1, =)$-identification problem, T_M be its associated rooted tree, and $P = (r = u_0, \ldots, u_k = l)$ be the path in T_M, from the root to a leaf l, whose all arcs are labeled "=". The partition $\mathcal{P}(l)$ consists in monocolored boxes, and exactly one 1-equal Red-green coloring

should be compatible with $\mathcal{P}(l)$. Hence it contains exactly one box of cardinality 1, all others being of cardinality at least 2.

If there are at most $\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor$ boxes in $\mathcal{P}(l)$ then the height of T_M is at least $N - \lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor$ and the desired inequality is verified.

When N is even, a partition of the balls verifying the property above cannot have more than $\frac{N}{2} = \lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor$ boxes (this bound is reached if and only if one box of $\mathcal{P}(l)$ has cardinality 1, another one has cardinality 3 and all others have cardinality 2). It remains to consider the case where N is odd and $\mathcal{P}(l)$ has at least $\lceil \frac{N}{2} \rceil$ boxes. This can happen only if all boxes of $\mathcal{P}(l)$ except one have cardinality 2. Consider now the "brother v of l", that is the other child of the father u of l. The partition of v is the same as the one of l except that there is exactly one bicolored box B, of Type $[1, 1]$. Then the green ball can be either of the two balls in B, and one more comparison should be done in order to conclude. Hence the height of T_M is at least $N - \lfloor \frac{N}{2} \rfloor$, and the proof is done. □

Proposition 2. *Let $N \geq 6$, we have :*

$$Q(N, 2, =) = N - \lfloor \frac{N+1}{3} \rfloor$$

Proof. We have verified by a computer program that this proposition holds for $N \leq 9$, so we may assume that $N \geq 10$. Furthermore, for any $N \geq 8$, the value of m as defined in Theorem 3 is 2, and so $Q(N, 2, =) \leq N + 1 - 2 - \lfloor \frac{N+2-2^2}{2+1} \rfloor = N - \lfloor \frac{N+1}{3} \rfloor$. Then it is sufficient to show that for any $N \geq 10$:

$$Q(N, 2, =) \geq N - \lfloor \frac{N+1}{3} \rfloor.$$

Let M be any method that solves the $(N, 2, =)$-identification problem, T_M be its associated rooted tree, and $P = (r = u_0, \ldots, u_k = l)$ be the path in T_M, from the root to a leaf l, whose all arcs are labeled "=". For each vertex of P, the associated partition consists only of monocolored boxes. A ball will be said *meager* if it is in a monocolored box of cardinality 1 or 2, else it is called *fat*. In the partition associated to the root, all N balls are meager and in $\mathcal{P}(l)$ at most 3 balls are meager (it is easy to verify that else there would be at least two 2-equal Red-green colorings of the balls compatible with $\mathcal{P}(l)$). After each comparison the number of meager balls changes as follows :

- it remains the same after comparing two fat balls or two balls in cardinality 1 boxes,
- it decreases by 1 after comparing a fat ball and a ball in a cardinality 1 box,
- it decreases by 2 after comparing a fat ball and a ball in a cardinality 2 box,

- it decreases by 3 after comparing a ball in a cardinality 1 box and a ball in a cardinality 2 box,

- it decreases by 4 after comparing balls in cardinality 2 boxes.

From the remarks above we may define k as the largest index such that $\mathcal{P}(u_k)$ has at least 10 meager balls. Then by definition of k and the possible decreases after one comparison, $\mathcal{P}(u_{k+1})$ contains at most 9 and at least 6 meager balls.

Let us assume that $\mathcal{P}(u_{k+1})$ contains n_1 boxes of Type $[0,1]$, n_2 boxes of Type $[0,2]$ and n_3 monocolored boxes of cardinality at least 3. We have $k+1 = N-(n_1+n_2+n_3)$, $m = n_1+n_2$ is the number of meager balls of $\mathcal{P}(u_{k+1})$ and $6 \leq m \leq 9$.

Obviously, in $\mathcal{P}(u_{k+1})$, the two green balls are either in one box of cardinality 2 or in two boxes of cardinality 1. This means that there are exactly $\binom{n_1}{2}+\binom{n_2}{1}$ 2-equal Red-green colorings compatible with $\mathcal{P}(u_{k+1})$ (we set $\binom{n_1}{2}=0$ for $n_1 \leq 1$). Then the subtree of T_M induced by u_{k+1} and all its descendants has $\binom{n_1}{2}+\binom{n_2}{1}$ leaves. By Property 2 we know then that at least $q(n_1,n_2) = \lceil \log_2(\binom{n_1}{2}+\binom{n_2}{1}) \rceil$ additional comparisons are necessary in order to have this number of leaves in the subtree. So, the height of T_M is at least $k+1+q(n_1,n_2)$. To end the proof, it is enough to show that

$$k+1+q(n_1,n_2) \geq N - \lfloor \frac{N+1}{3} \rfloor$$

or equivalently (since $k+1+q(n_1,n_2)$ is an integer)

$$3N-3n_1-3n_2-3n_3+3q(n_1,n_2) \geq 3N-N-1.$$

Since $N = n_1+2n_2+3n_3+e$ for some $e \geq 0$ this is the same as

$$e+1 \geq 2n_1+n_2-3q(n_1,n_2).$$

As $6 \leq m \leq 9$ and n_1 and n_2 should be such that $n_1+2n_2=m$, there is only a finite number of cases to consider. These are summarized in Table 1. Since in all cases we get $2n_1+n_2-3q(n_1,n_2) \leq 1$, the needed inequality indeed holds. □

m	6	6	6	6	7	7	7	7	8	8	8	8	8	9	9	9	9	9
n_1	6	4	2	0	7	5	3	1	8	6	4	2	0	9	7	5	3	1
n_2	0	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4
$2n_1+n_2-3q(n_1,n_2)$	0	0	0	-3	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1	1	-2	0	0	0	0	0

Table 1: The value of $2n_1+n_2-3q(n_1,n_2)$ for $6 \leq n_1+2n_2=m \leq 9$.

Propositions 1 and 2 show that, for $p=1$ or 2, the upper bound $Q_+(N,p,=)$ given by Theorem 3, is in fact the right value of $Q(N,p,=)$. This is however

not true for any value of p as shown by our programs. For $N \leq 30$ and $p < \frac{N}{2}$ it happens several times that $Q(N,p,=) = Q_+(N,p,=) - 1$ (see Table 2), once that $Q(N,p,=) = Q_+(N,p,=) - 2$ (for $(N,p) = (30,4)$) and for all other couples (N,p) the equality $Q(N,p,=) = Q_+(N,p,=)$ holds. It is not surprising that $Q_+(N,p,=)$ is not always the right value of $Q(N,p,=)$ since the proof of Theorem 3 uses the upper bound of Theorem 1 which may be 1 more than the true value (by Theorem 2).

Remark 1. *It seems very likely to us that using a proof similar to the one of Proposition 2 one could show that for each $p \geq 3$ there exists a constant $c(p)$ such that $Q(N,p) \geq Q_+(N,p,=) - c(p)$. However this is probably tedious to prove.*

N	17	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30
p	3	3, 4	3	5	5	3, 4	3, 4, 6	6	3, 4, 5	3, 4, 5, 7	3, 4, 5, 6, 7	3, 6, 8

Table 2: The values of N and p such that $Q(N,p,=) = Q_+(N,p,=) - 1$.

3 Some additional remarks

3.1 Other formulations

The problems we considered here on a set of bicolored balls are also known with other equivalent formulations.

One example is : we are given a set of coins having two possible weights, some coins are faked, we don't know if they are heavier or lighter, but we know that there are less fake coins than true coins and we may only compare the weights of two coins with a two-pan balance.

Another formulation is the following. The population of an island is composed of "knights", who always tell the truth, and "knaves", who always lie (these names come from Smullyan book [7] but the same problem appears with several other terms). There are more knights than knaves in the population and everyone knows the status of each. A visitor is allowed to choose couples (a,b) of inhabitants of the island and ask a : "Is b a knight ?". A"yes" answer to the question will always mean that a and b are of the same kind and a "no" answer that they are of different kinds. So this is exactly the result of a comparison...

In any of these formulations one may be interested by finding one object in the majority, or one object in the minority, or the status of all objects, ..., by doing a minimum number of comparisons. To our knowledge the case where the cardinalities of the subsets are fixed has not been studied before.

The problem above is a particular case of a more general problem, where it is assumed that the inhabitants are divided into "knights" and "spies", with

a majority of knights. A spy can either lie or tell the truth. This problem too has been studied with other names. In particular there is a formulation in terms of chips testing [4]. Notice that surprisingly the minimum number of questions needed to find a knight is the same in the "knights and knaves" and in the "knights and spies" cases [4]: $N - b(N)$ (as explained at the beginning of the paper for the Majority problem). In fact Alonso et al [4] showed that any algorithm which solves the Majority problem can be used to solve this knights and knaves problem, and both algorithms behave the same in the worst case. However this seems not to be true for the average-case [3]. Also, the minimum number of questions to ask in order to know the status of everyone is different : $N + p - 1$ [5].

3.2 A game

The $(N, p, \leq)$- and $(N, p, =)$-identification problems can be viewed as a game between two players named "Maker" and "Breaker". At the beginning of each step, Maker chooses the two balls to compare and then Breaker decides the answer of the comparison. The answers however, should always allow at least one compatible p-majored (resp. p-equal) Red-green coloring of the balls.

The two players agree on an integer $0 \leq q \leq N - 1$. The winner is Maker if, after at most q steps, he is able to know the colors of all balls, and else it is Breaker. So, clearly, Maker is sure to win as soon as $q \geq Q(N, p, \leq)$ (resp. $q \geq Q(N, p, =)$).

The proofs of the lower bound for the Majority problem by Saks and Werman [6], and later [8], use this game approach. Blecher [5] used it also for the Knights and Knaves problem described above. Other authors [1, 9] used this game approach for similar problems.

3.3 The ultimate formulation

The most abstract formulation of a game corresponding to the $(N, p, =)$-identification problem is the following.

The game begin with two integers N, p such that $0 \leq 2p < N$, and an initial pattern of N couples $(1, 0)$.

After $N-k$ steps we will have a pattern of k unordered couples $(u_1, v_1) \ldots (u_k, v_k)$ such that the u_i's and v_i's are non negative integers.

We define $C((u_1, v_1) \ldots (u_k, v_k), p, =)$ as being equal to the value of :
$|\{(r_1, \ldots, r_k) \in \Pi_{1 \leq i \leq k}\{u_i, v_i\} | r_1 + \ldots + r_k = p\}|$.

The next pattern is obtained as follows : Maker chooses two indices l and m such that $1 \leq l < m \leq k$, we will keep in the pattern all (u_i, v_i)'s, $l \neq i \neq m$, and we will merge the couples (u_l, v_l) and (u_m, v_m) replacing them by a unique couple which will be either $(u_l + v_m, v_l + u_m)$ or $(u_l + u_m, v_l + v_m)$. It is Breaker who decide which one of these couples has to be chosen, with the additional

condition that, denoting the new pattern by $(u'_1, v'_1) \dots (u'_{k-1}; v'_{k-1})$, we have $C((u'_1, v'_1) \dots (u'_{k-1}, v'_{k-1})) > 0$.

Maker and Breaker agree on an integer q (with $0 \leq q \leq N-1$) and Breaker wins if $C((u_1, v_1), \dots, (u_{N-q}, v_{N-q)}, p, =) > 1$, otherwise Maker wins.

Clearly the minimum value of q allowing Maker (assuming that he plays perfectly) to be sure to win, whatever Breaker plays, is $Q(n, p, =)$.

Indeed this is the same problem as the bicolored balls, but we limit ourselves to a minimal quantity of information (the one given by the patterns) without even speaking of the set of N bicolored balls.

We remark that $C((u_1, v_1), \dots, (u_k, v_k), p, =)$ is nothing else than the number of possible colorings with the pattern $(u_1, v_1) \dots (u_k, v_k)$.

Without loss of generality we may assume that we merge (u_1, v_1) and $(u_2 v_2)$ and we check easily that: $C((u_1+u_2, v_1+v_2)(u_3, v_3), \dots, (u_k, v_k), p, =)+C((u_1+v_2, v_1+u_2)(u_3, v_3), \dots, (u_k, v_k), p, =)$ is equal to $C((u_1, v_1), \dots, (u_k, v_k), p, =)$.

Breaker may use a "majority strategy": when Maker has chosen to merge the couples (u_l, v_l) and (u_m, v_m), Breaker will choose the couple among $(u_l + v_m, v_l + u_m)$ and $(u_l + u_m, v_l + v_m)$ which maximize the number of colorings of the subsequent patterns (or any of the couples if this number of coloration is the same).

Remark 2. *If we have the pattern $(u_1, v_1) \dots (u_k, v_k)$ and if Breaker uses a "majority strategy" then the preceding relation shows that Maker will need at least $\lceil \log_2 C((u_1, v_1), \dots, (u_k, v_k)) \rceil$ more steps to get a number of colorings equal to 1.*

We also notice that this strategy allows Breaker to be sure that
$C((u'_1, v'_1) \dots (u'_{k-1}, v'_{k-1})) > 0$ in case we had already
$C((u_1, v_1) \dots (u_k, v_k)) > 0$.

On his side, Maker may apply a strategy (for the choice of l and m) which minimizes the number of colorings in case Breaker uses a "majority strategy".

What has just been done concerns the case of the $(N, p, =)$-identification problem but it is easy to find an analogous interpretation for the case of the $(N, p, \leq)$-identification problem. We remark that the found upper bounds for $Q(N, p, =)$ and $Q(N, p, \leq)$ are the work of Maker and the found lower bounds for $Q(N, p, \leq)$ and $Q(N, 2, =)$ are the work of Breaker.

Question : Is it possible to improve the strategies of respectively Maker and Breaker in a way to give better bounds for $Q(N, p, \leq)$ and $Q(N, p, =)$?

Complementary remarks :

1) In the patterns, we may use the multiplicative notation, replacing r times the couple (u, v) : $(u, v) \dots (u, v)$, by $(u, v)^r$.

2) Maker may decide to merge more than two couples regardless of the answers of Breaker. Example : if $N = 17$, Maker may (at the beginning of the game) merge four times three couples $(1, 0)$, the result will be a pattern $(1, 0)^5$ $(3, 0)^k$ $(2, 1)^{4-k}$, for $0 \leq k \leq 4$.

3) The initial problem could be generalized fro more than two colors.

References

[1] Martin Aigner, *Variants of the Majority Problem*, Discrete Applied Mathematics, 137 Issue 1 (2004). 3–25, 1st International Workshop on Combinatorics of Searching, Sorting, and Coding (COSSAC '01) (Ischia).

[2] Laurent Alonso, Edward M. Reingold and René Schott, *Determining the Majority*, Information Processing Letters 47 (1993), 253–255.

[3] Laurent Alonso, Edward M. Reingold and René Schott, *The Average-Case Complexity of Determining the Majority*, SIAM Journal on Computing 26 (1997), 1–14.

[4] Laurent Alonso, Philippe Chassaing, Edward M. Reingold and René Schott, *The Worst-Case Chip Problem*, Information Processing Letters 89 (2004).

[5] Pavel M. Blecher, *On a logical problem*, Discrete Mathematics 43 Issue 1 (1983), 107–110.

[6] Michael E. Saks and Michael Werman, *On Computing Majority by Comparisons*, Combinatorica 11 (1991), 383–387.

[7] Raymond Smullyan, What is the Name of this Book?, Prentice-Hall(1978).

[8] Gábor Wiener, *Search for a majority element*, Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference 100 Issue 2 (2002), 313-318.

[9] Mark Wildon, *Knights, spies, games and ballot sequences*, Discrete Mathematics 310 Issue 21 (2010), 2974–2983.

[10] Mark Wildon, *Searching for knights and spies: A majority/minority game*, Discrete Mathematics 339 Issue 11 (2016), 2754–2766.